DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 224 067 CS 504 047

AUTHOR Carstens, Jerald
TITLE Perceptions of C. E. O.'s Personnel Managers, and Training Directors of Communication Practices and Listening Behavior in Large-Scale Organizations.
PUB DATE Nov 82
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (68th, Louisville, KY, November 4-7, 1982).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Business Education; Business Skills; *Communication Problems; Communication Research; *Communication Skills; Higher Education; *Listening Skills; *Organizational Communication; *Speech Curriculum

ABSTRACT

A survey of business people was conducted to assess the importance of listening and the deficiency in that skill and to identify existing listening training programs for future study. The questionnaire was developed to assess the importance and status of listening by placing it randomly among several other communication competencies. Subjects were the presidents, personnel directors, and training directors of 72 corporations with over 1,000 employees. Nineteen presidents, 16 personnel directors, 25 training directors, and 11 other corporate officers from 45 corporations responded. Telephone interviews followed up on those companies that had listening training programs, and permission was asked to observe those programs. Results indicated that sending messages was perceived as more important than receiving them; however, listening, a receptive skill, was considered more important than reading and speaking. Receptive skills were more important in the oral medium, while expressive skills were more important in the written mode. Overall, the oral was the more important medium. The results indicate that improving listening skills deserves special attention from trainers and communication educators. (JL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED224067

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

PERCEPTIONS OF C.E.O.'S PERSONNEL MANAGERS, AND TRAINING DIRECTORS OF COMMUNICATION PRACTICES AND LISTENING BEHAVIOR IN LARGE-SCALE ORGANIZATIONS

by

Jerald Carstens

Assistant Professor

Department of Speech Communications and Theatre Arts

University of Wisconsin-River Falls

River Falls, Wisconsin

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jerald Carstens

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS206447

PERCEPTIONS OF C.E.O.'S, PERSONNEL MANAGERS, AND TRAINING DIRECTORS OF COMMUNICATION PRACTICES AND LISTENING BEHAVIOR IN LARGE-SCALE ORGANIZATIONS

Introduction

Training in communication has undergone many changes in the last decade. During the 1960's academic institutions were offering courses in speech, and near the end of the decade many had initiated offerings in interpersonal and small group communication. The career orientation of this training was still education, and few saw the need to look beyond this orientation. The 1970's have imposed changes on communication education, and it is safe to say that many more changes will be seen in the next decade.

The present condition includes course work offered at most academic institutions in such areas as organizational communication, business and professional speaking, interviewing, internships, and other business-related communication areas. University faculty members are more frequently making contact with business people. They may do so as they try to find placement for interns and graduates. They may also do so as part-time consultants and trainers. It is safe to observe that the career orientation of current communication education has become less toward education and more toward business and the professions.

One aspect of communication education which has gone unnoticed or slightly noticed at most academic institutions is listening. If a course in this area is offered at an institution, it is probably limited to just one. Where such courses are available, they often are oriented to the needs of teachers much as their counterparts in speech were in the 1960's. Such an orientation is clearly justifiable, but the need for good listening in business has been suggested by several studies.

The writer undertook a study of business communication as an effort to explore the need which had been suggested by those previous studies. A questionnaire was prepared which gave respondents an opportunity to confirm the importance they attach to listening. To expand upon the notion that listening is important to business communication, respondents were then asked to select from a group of tested communication options (including listening) as an indication of the communication competencies most lacking in their organization. Using the same options, they were asked next to indicate the competencies which are/should be included in corporate training and university education. Corporate executives (presidents, training directors, and personnel directors) were sent the questionnaire and asked to respond to it personally. The returned questionnaires are summarized and discussed in this paper. The findings and discussion extend beyond the area of listening, but that area is emphasized. In addition to the survey findings, a follow-up review of existing listening training programs in the business organizations responding to the study is summarized.

Review of Related Literature

The study of communication in occupations dates at least as far back as the often-quoted Rankin study of the 1920's.[1] Rankin had subjects keep inventories of the time they spent in communication during the waking day. The occupational groups he studied were teachers, housewives, and a miscellaneous category. This was hardly a study of business communication, but it did recognize the need to study forms of communication used in occupations. The most commonly-quoted findings of the Rankin study center around the amount of time spent in communication and the relative use of various forms of communication. His findings that 70% of the waking day is spent in communication and that listening is most pervasive (42.1%), speaking second (31.9%), reading third (15%)

and writing least frequently used (11%) are so often quoted that they are considered a commonplace among communication educators. Rankin's preface to the English Journal article is less frequently quoted but interesting when considered in light of the more than forty years which have passed since it was published:

> Listening, or the ability to understand spoken language, is the most frequently used of the four language arts. The significance of the study lies in its contribution to curriculum-building in language.[2]

One can only hope that Rankin's findings are more reliable than his speculation about the consequence of those findings.

If replication verifies research results, Rankin's finding that listening is the most widely used of the forms of communication seems to be confirmed. The concept of studying the relative importance of forms of communication in occupational settings has also been reaffirmed. During the present decade, several such studies have been reported in the literature. DiSalvo, Larsen, and Seiler surveyed business administration graduates of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Of ten communication competencies, listening was rated most important regardless of communication channel. They also found their respondents ranked listening second among communication skills necessary for success in past and present job experience. Advising was the most important skill identified in response to this question.[3]

A more recent survey by Michael Hanna found fault with the terms used by DiSalvo and his colleagues because they were not operationally defined.[4] Hanna did a pilot study just to develop terms which would be meaningful to people in management positions of business organizations. Eleven such terms, including listening, were identified. When the study was done, Hanna found listening to be the most troublesome communication situation for all employees.

When weighed for rank order, listening was the second most troublesome situation for this group; motivating people was the most troublesome. When Hanna broke that finding down among the various positions in the organizations, listening was cited as most troublesome only among the group identified as "labor force." "Managers" and "supervisors" found such situations as motivating people, delegating authority, and giving directions more troublesome. This finding suggests perception of listening deficiency may be a corollary of rank in the organizational chain of command. Hanna's study went on to consider purposes for communication and contexts most commonly used in business.[5]

A shared interest in communication training in business has been demonstrated by trainers and communication educators. A survey recently reported in Training Magazine concerned itself with the communication education of trainers. The survey which was done by Wallace V. Schmidt, a member of the Hofstra-Cornell Management Studies Program, found that only 5.1% of the trainers had majored in communication on either the undergraduate level or in graduate work. Yet, three of the five areas these trainers identified as very important training skills were clearly communication skills. They were interpersonal communication, listening, and group discussion. When asked the areas in which they offered training, the respondents indicated little or no attention was given to listening. However, they identified interpersonal communication and interviewing among the areas given greatest attention in their training programs.[6]

Two surveys recently reported in communication journals also are concerned with communication training in business. Wasylik, Sussman, and Leri found that 95% of the respondents in their survey of trainers in the Pittsburgh area offered training in at least one communication skill. Listening was offered

by thirty-six of the trainers included in this study (65.5%). Again listening was perceived as the most important communication skill in the organization as indicated by mean ranks of the respondents of this study.[7] Meister and Reinsch surveyed training offered in manufacturing firms in Illinois. Only 34% of the companies they studied had training programs, but 69% of the companies with over 1,000 employees offered some kind of employee training. Listening was perceived as an aspect of communication by 81% of the respondents when they were asked for a definition of communication. Listening was identified as the primary area of deficiency among new trainees of these industrial firms. A majority of their respondents indicated that listening was a part of their training programs.[8]

Not all relevant research in this field takes the form of a survey. Listening can be dealt with through various experimental tecnhiques. A study by Buchli and Pearce used an experimental design with a pretest and posttest technique to measure the effect of listener agreement on listening effectiveness. Their study with 117 University of North Dakota students found that coorientational factors do have an effect upon listening.[9] Authority, power, and position in an employment relationship fit their definition of coorientation factors. This research and its findings would seem to shed some light on Hanna's finding that listening deficiency is more frequently recognized by those at the lower levels of an organization.

Studies of business communication have been reported rather frequently in recent publications. Studies of listening are less frequent but available in the literature. A study of business communication which focuses on listening has not been done even though listening is the communication skill which has consistently been identified as most important in business communication studies.

Design and Method

Because the literature has already established that listening is important to business and that it is perceived as being deficient, the writer attempted to determine what is being done to remedy the deficiency and determine what business executives think should be done. The study was done by surveying business people to assess the importance of listening and the deficiency in that skill. The survey would also identify existing listening training programs in business organizations which could be studied in more detail by a follow-up interview and field study.

The questionnaire was developed to assess the specific communication competency, listening, by placing it randomly among several others. It asked respondents to select the communication form-competency which:

(1) was more important to the organization

(2) was most lacking among personnel of the organization

(3) should be given greater attention by colleges and universities

(4) was included in corporate training

(5) should be included in corporate training

Communication forms included in the first question were paired, and the respondent was asked to indicate which of the two options was more important. As an example, the first pair asked which was more important, sending messages or receiving messages. The communication forms were included because each had an exact opposite. While all of the pairs gave insights into the nature of business communication, a series of four pairs was included near the center of the entire list. These four pairs asked respondents to compare the terms which were previously studied by Rankin.[10] The expressive (speaking and writing) skills were compared with their respective counterparts, the receptive skills (listening and reading). The oral medium (speaking and listening) was compared

with its respective counterpart, the written medium (writing and reading).

Communication competencies were provided following the first question from which responses for questions two, three, four and five were to be selected. The communication competencies provided were taken from the terms which had previously been tested by Hanna.[11] Listening was among the eleven terms identified by Chief Executive Officers or their designees in the pilot study he conducted to find meaningful terms before conducting his survey. "Other" was added to Hanna's list, creating twelve options for these questions. They were arranged alphabetically, and listening appeared near the center. Each of the four questions provided three blanks, but instructions to rank order the response were not included.

Corporations which are chartered in the Ninth Federal Reserve District and which have 1,000 or more employees were placed on the mailing list. These corporations were identified in the 1978 edition of the Corporate Report Fact Book.[12] The presidents of these seventy-two corporations were contacted by name, and the Training Director and Personnel Director of each organization were contacted by title. Each individual was asked to respond personally and not to refer the questionnaire to someone else. Self-addressed stamped envelopes were included with this mailing. A second mailing of the questionnaire to each person was sent approximately one month after the first if a return had not been received. The cover letter with the second mailing was somewhat less forceful in asking the person contacted to respond personally.

The follow-up of listening training was undertaken by telephoning the respondents who indicated their organization offered such training. They were asked a number of questions concerning the nature and content of the training. They were also asked if it would be permissible for the writer to observe the training. The respondents identified two commercially available training

programs in listening, and the companies which produce and distribute these courses were also contacted for information and permission to observe.

Results

A total of seventy-one responses were received. They came from the nineteen corporate presidents, sixteen personnel directors, twenty-five training directors, and eleven other corporate officers. Forty-five corporations are represented in the response. This represents 62.5% of the organizations contacted. Two responses were obtained from twenty-four organizations, and one company provided three returned questionnaires. Two returned questionnaires were not completed because the respondents did not wish to generalize for their organizations. These responses are not counted as part of the seventy-two reported in the following tables. Corporate size for the organizations represented by the respondents ranged from 1,050 employees to 70,775 employees. A total of 446,300 people are employed by the organizations whose executives responded to the survey. The average size of the organization represented is 9,917 employees.

The tables which follow report the frequency of responses to the five questions included on the questionnaire. The first table lists the pairs from which respondents were asked to select the terms which represented the form of communication which was more important to the organization. Since respondents were asked to select from the same eleven competencies for the remaining four questions, the tables for those questions take a similar form. The "other" responses for each of the questions are reported following these tables. The responses to each question of the survey do not total seventy-one because respondents often chose not to answer individual questions.

In reviewing the "other" responses to the last four questions of the survey, a considerable range can be noted. The more common responses in this area were related to the need for improving writing ability and "all" responses which referred to all eleven options provided for these questions. The need for improving writing was evident in responses to all four questions. Such responses as "report writing" and "business writing" were more specific variations on this expressed need. The "all" responses were given only for the two questions which had to do with corporate training. Some respondents indicated that their organizations provided training in all eleven areas "except. . ." or "plus . . .," and a particular area would be identified. The "other" responses for the question on areas in which colleges and universities should provide additional training produced two items specifying oral communication and two specifying committee leadership. All of the remaining "other" responses appeared only once.

Discussion

A comparison of the receptive skills and expressive skills which were paired in the first question provides some insights. The composite findings indicate that sending messages is perceived as more important than receiving them. Rankin found that message reception accounted for 57.1% of the time given to communication among his subjects. This study finds that only 38.1% of the respondents feel receiving messages is more important than sending them. However, listening, a receptive skill, when compared with both speaking and reading was considered more important. It prevailed over reading among all categories of business executives with a composite of fifty-eight indicating that listening was more important than reading. Only nine found reading to be more important. Speaking was considered more important than listening by

twenty-six respondents, but thirty-eight thought listening was more important. The finding that message reception is less important than expression in the first pair of items would seem inconsistent with the importance attached to listening by these executives in the subsequent pairs. But, when the reading and listening findings are totaled and compared with the total for speaking and writing, the expressive skills prevail. Writing was the least pervasive form of communication according to the Rankin study, but the results of this study indicate that business executives consider it much more important than reading. Personnel directors consider writing even more important than speaking. Training directors, however, consider speaking more important than listening. The composite results indicate that receptive skills are considered more important in the oral medium, but expressive skills are more important in the written mode. Additionally, these results indicate that oral medium is more important than its written counterpart.

Viewing other responses to the first question with a focus on listening is justified by the importance attached to it by the executives responding to that question. Internal communication is clearly considered more important than external. Listening within the organization may, therefore, deserve special attention by trainers and communication educators. The importance attached to listening in the first question coupled with the finding in the second question that listening is the most deficient competency suggest a change in focus for trainers and educators when dealing with interpersonal and small group communication in the business setting. This is underscored by the finding that face-to-face and informal communication clearly prevail over their counterparts in the first question. Similarly, improving listening skill when dealing with informative messages is indicated as an educational goal

worthy of emphasis. This listening-centered analysis of the first question may seem unusual because a typical approach to the reading of findings is in terms of expressive not receptive skills. With the finding that these business executives consider listening to be more important than speaking, other comparisons in the response can quite correctly be reviewed with a receiving perspective.

The composite findings also indicate that listening is the prevailing response in the second question. That question asked which communication competencies were most lacking in the personnel of the organization. Delegating authority and motivating people were also frequently identified as deficient. This question can be analyzed fruitfully by looking to the different executive positions. Presidents considered delegating authority and motivating people more deficient in their organizations than listening. Hanna's findings and the experimental findings of Buchli and Pearce would seem to confirm this perception. The expression that listening is deficient in an organization may indicate frustration and powerlessness. That corporate presidents do not consider it as deficient as do others in their organizations would appear to be an indication that people listen more carefully to those in powerful positions. The presidents' perspective is clearly distinct from the perspective of those at other levels. Delegating authority and motivating people clearly emerge as less deficient than listening when considered by personnel directors and training directors. Power and authority are an identifiable variable which may account for this discrepancy.

Questions three and five asked where communication training should be provided. Those questions dealt with university training and corporate training respectively, and they asked which areas should be included in

these training programs. Listening was identified as the competency which the largest number suggested for both university education and corporate training. Group problem solving was the second most frequently selected response for both questions. Motivating people was the third most frequent suggestion for university training, but delegating authority was third most frequently suggested for corporate training. Corporate presidents think their own training programs should provide training in motivating people, and training in listening is less frequently endorsed by them. Training directors express greater support for training in group problem solving than for listening. These deviations from the composite are very small, however.

Questions four and five inquired into existing corporate training and support for corporate training in the various competencies. The fourth question asked respondents to indicate competencies in which the organization provides training and the fifth question asked them to identify competencies in which the organization should provide training, recognizing that they may not already be doing so. A comparison of the responses to these questions reveals that training is most frequently provided in motivating people, group problem solving, and formal presentations. Support for corporate training was most frequently indicated in the areas of listening, group problem solving, and delegating authority. Of these areas, group problem solving and delegating authority were identified more frequently as areas of existing training than as ones suggested for training. Listening was the only one where more support was indicated for corporate training than the number of existing programs. Other areas in which few corporate training programs exist also had more respondents indicating such training should be provided. These areas include: conference leadership, giving

directions, negotiation and bargaining, handling grievances, and grapevine communication. This finding might suggest areas in which communication educators and trainers could initiate programs.

Previous studies of business communication found that offering communication training was common, particularly among companies with over 1,000 employees. The present study found that fifty-eight responses of the seventy-one received (81%) indicated that training in at least one communication skill was included in corporate training. Eight respondents (13%) indicated no communication training was offered. Five respondents did not deal in any way with this question. Of the fifty-eight providing communication training, two listed only one communication competency, six included two competencies, forty-one indicated three (this may have been influenced by the three blanks provided), and nine indicated more than three areas of communication training.

Listening was indicated as a part of the communication training by nine respondents (13% of the sixty-six responding to this question). This finding departs significantly from the findings of previous researchers in this area. Wasylik and his colleagues found 65.5% of the trainers in their study included listening training while Meister and Reinsch found 53% included listening. Because two of the listening training programs identifed by the present study were identified by two respondents each, the actual number of programs in this area was only seven.

When one reviews the findings, then, the importance of listening in business communication was verified. It was found that listening was considered the most deficient of the communication competencies listed. Respondents supported listening training more than any of the other options

offered for university and corporate training programs. However, only seven of the forty-five corporations included in this sample (15.5%) provided such training.

Because only seven of the corporations surveyed have listening training programs, the follow-up was relatively easy. The organizations were contacted by telephone and they were asked to describe the listening training they offer. Several common characteristics were apparent. All the corporate training in listening is part of large programs in the corporate training program. In one organization, it is offered for new employees who will use the telephone to solicit stock sales. In another organization it is offered every four months to sales personnel who select this program over others. For two organizations, listening is part of a communication training program. It is offered in-house by trainers who nearly always (one exception) include either the Xerox or Dun and Bradstreet materials on listening. The one trainer who does not use these materials indicated that he used information acquired from a training organization and through his own personal research. Most of the programs had been offered for several years, and the person contacted expressed support and even enthusiasm for such training.

Since the purpose of this study had been to gain a familiarity with the nature and content of listening training offered by corporations, the simple telephone interviews with the seven organizations identified by the survey hardly seemed sufficient. A request to observe the training when it was being offered produced several invitations and potential invitations. Contacts with Xerox and Dun and Bradstreet produced pamphlets and literature describing the listening courses they sell and invitations to observe the courses. The commercial training organization which had been identified

by one trainer as the source for his original material on listening was contacted. These contacts revealed that listening training is often sold as part of larger training programs in sales and management training. These courses stress critical listening and listening for recall. They include a number of exercises, and they provide general information about listening. They are very carefully packaged to the point of offering monogrammed cassette cases and special recorders. Descriptive brochures are available, but they are not easy to obtain because listening is more frequently marketed as part of these larger training programs. The Xerox course consisting of four units sells for $110.00 plus $13.00 for each "Trainee Kit." The Dun and Bradstreet course claims to raise listening effectiveness above the 25% national average while the Xerox course claims a 60% average gain in test scores following the course. Both courses were founded in consultation with Dr. Ralph Nichols of the University of Minnesota. The Dun and Bradstreet course depends heavily upon Nichols' material. The Xerox course which was revised in 1976 is less dependent upon his material but is clearly influenced by it.

Recognizing that all listening training is not of the in-house variety, the writer is currently in the process of examining programs offered by consultant trainers. It would appear that this kind of specialist training is far less common than that offered in-house. This phenomenon may not be satisfactory to communication educators or the in-house trainers themselves. Trainers indicated in the Schmidt survey that they felt that consultants and other outside resources should be utilized whenever funds are available. Communication educators would appear to have a legitimate concern when such programs are offered by in-house trainers who, according to the same study, lack communication training.[13] On the other hand, the absence of such training when the need is clearly expressed

would also appear to be a legitimate concern for communication educators. A need for either specialist training in communication or communication education for trainers is indicated.

Conclusion

Many of the findings of the current survey of business communication confirm the findings of previous researchers. It was determined that listening is the most important of the four communication forms which have been compared since the 1920's: reading, writing, speaking and listening. It was also found that listening is the communication competency considered most deficient among the business executives surveyed. However, this deficiency is not as acutely perceived by corporate presidents as by other executives. This finding would also seem to confirm previous findings. The existence of communication training by corporations is confirmed, and the previous finding that such training is offered by a substantial percentage of large corporations is developed in greater detail.

Some findings of the current study raise questions about the accuracy or application of previous research. That reading is considered far less important than writing in business and that writing is nearly as important as speaking are findings which would not seem to be consistent with previous research. The frequency of listening training in corporate communication training programs would appear to be far lower than found in previous studies.

Several new findings are indicated by this research. The importance attached to internal communication when compared with external is very pronounced. The consistent finding that listening is important, deficient, and the area of greatest need for additional training at universities and in corporate training underscores the need in this area. The nature

of corporate training programs in listening has not previously been investigated in a systematic way, and the present follow-up study in that area is on-going.

The survey findings are based upon the responses of seventy-one business executives to five questions included in a questionnaire. These findings are an indication of a recognition of the importance and nature of business communication, but they do not claim to be scientifically accurate or to present a complete understanding of communication in that setting. Individual findings certainly deserve much more complete investigation. This study when considered along with others that have been done in the area of business communication may be useful in planning curriculum and course units.It particularly focuses upon listening, and it establishes that area as one in which business executives recognize a need for improvement.

Table I

QUESTION: In the following series of pairs, circle the item which represents the form of communication of greater importance in your organization.

President	Personnel Dir.	Training Dir.	Other Executive	COMPOSITE	EQUAL	PAIRS	President	Personnel Dir.	Training Dir.	Other Executive	COMPOSITE
10	7	16	6	39		SENDING MESSAGES OR RECEIVING MESSAGES	7	7	7	3	24
7	7	12	6	32	1	INITIATING MESSAGES OR RESPONDING TO MESSAGES	10	7	10	3	30
11	13	16	6	46	2	INTERNAL COMMUNICATION OR EXTERNAL COMMUNICATION	5	2	6	2	15
6	10	10	5	31		WRITING OR SPEAKING	11	5	15	4	35
16	14	21	7	58		LISTENING OR READING	1	1	5	2	9
5	5	13	3	26	3	SPEAKING OR LISTENING	12	10	14	6	40
9	13	17	7	46	1	WRITING OR READING	8	2	7	2	19
6	5	11	2	24	1	PERSUADING OR INFORMING	10	10	14	6	40
12	7	14	5	18	2	FACE TO FACE COMMUNICATION OR INDIRECT COMMUNICATION (telephone, memo, letter)	4	8	12	4	28
8	12	14	8	42	2	INFORMAL COMMUNICATION OR GROUP PRESENTATIONS	7	3	11	1	22

Table II

QUESTION: Indicate the communication competencies most lacking in the personnel of your organization.

	Conference Leadership	Group Problem Solving	Listening	Grapevine	Delegating Authority	Giving Directions	Motivating People	One-on-One	Formal Presentations	Grievances	Negotiation and Bargaining
Presidents	4	6	6	2	10	6	10	1	2	2	0
Personnel Directors	1	2	9	0	5	3	7	1	5	2	1
Training Directors	6	6	15	4	10	5	8	5	5	5	5
Other Executives	1	1	5	0	4	1	3	2	3	3	2
COMPOSITE	12	15	35	6	29	15	28	9	15	12	8

Table III

QUESTION: Indicate the communication competencies in which you feel colleges and universities should provide more training.

	Conference Leadership	Group Problem Solving	Listening	Grapevine	Delegating Authority	Giving Directions	Motivating People	One-on-One	Formal Presentations	Grievances	Negotiation and Bargaining
Presidents	5	5	8	1	4	3	7	2	2	0	6
Personnel Directors	2	3	9	0	3	3	3	3	5	1	0
Training Directors	5	9	14	1	3	4	11	4	7	4	6
Other Executives	1	4	4	0	3	2	3	1	4	2	1
COMPOSITE	13	21	35	2	13	12	24	10	18	7	13

Table IV

QUESTION: Indicate the communication competencies in which your organization provides training

	Conference Leadership	Group Problem Solving	Listening	Grapevine	Delegating Authority	Giving Directions	Motivating People	One-on-One	Formal Presentations	Grievances	Negotiation and Bargaining
Presidents	6	9	1	0	6	2	11	3	7	1	3
Personnel Directors	2	3	3	0	1	0	6	0	4	1	1
Training Directors	1	9	4	0	7	4	12	8	6	3	2
Other Executives	1	3	1	0	4	1	3	2	2	1	1
COMPOSITE	10	24	9	0	18	7	32	13	19	6	7

Table V

QUESTION: Indicate the communication competencies in which your organization should provide training (recognizing that you may not already be doing so).

	Conference Leadership	Group Problem Solving	Listening	Grapevine	Delegating Authority	Giving Directions	Motivating People	One-on-One	Formal Presentations	Grievances	Negotiation and Bargaining
Presidents	3	5	5	0	4	3	6	4	0	1	2
Personnel Directors	1	4	6	0	3	1	3	1	1	0	2
Training Directors	7	10	8	1	6	3	4	4	5	5	6
Other Executives	3	1	4	0	3	2	2	2	1	1	1
COMPOSITE	14	20	23	1	16	9	15	11	7	7	11

[1]Paul Rankin, "The Importance of Listening Ability", ENGLISH JOURNAL, 17 (October, 1928), 623-630.

[2]Rankin, p. 623

[3]Vincent DiSalvo, David C. Larsen, and William J. Seiler, "Communication Skills Needed by Persons in Business Organization", COMMUNICATION EDUCATION, 25 (November, 1976), 269-275.

[4]Michale S. Hanna, "Speech Communication Training Needs in the Business Community", CENTRAL STATES SPEECH JOURNAL, 29 (Fall, 1978), 164.

[5]Hanna, pp. 163-172.

[6]"Trainers: Who They Are, What They Think", TRAINING, 16 (February, 1979), 18.

[7]James E. Wasylik, Lyle Sussman, and Robert Leri, "Communication Training as Perceived by Training Personnel", COMMUNICATION QUARTERLY, 24 (Winter, 1976), 32-38.

[8]Janis E. Meister and N. L. Reinsch, Jr., "Communication Training in Manufacturing Firms", COMMUNICATION EDUCATION, 27 (September, 1978), 235-244.

[9]Virginia Buchli and W. Barnett Pearce, "Listening Behavior in Coorientational States", JOURNAL OF COMMUNICATION, 24 (Summer, 1974), 62-70.

[10]Rankin, pp. 623-630.

[11]Hanna, p. 166.

[12]CORPORATE REPORT FACT BOOK, 1978 ed., (Minneapolis: Dorn Communications, Inc., 1977.)

[13]"Trainers....," p. 18.